

Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700356

A. List of Restoration Activities

The Project is to permanently close unauthorized user created motorized roads and return of land, plant communities, and plant covers to conditions comparable to those of surrounding lands. The Project is approximately 1 mile in length and is located on the west side of Chalfant Valley.

Treatments include: barricading motorized access by the placement of large native rocks or wood post and beam barricades; vertical mulching; planting and seeding of native vegetation; hand construction of water control devices; interruptive and educational signing of BLM's actions and public outreach.

The Project is in conjunction with rerouting a designated motorized route.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

The unauthorized routes have reduced plant cover and in some instances are on steep slopes which is causing soil to wash away from the road tread.

The unauthorized routes have been created because the only designate north/south and east/west OHV route was passing through private property and the owners began barricading against trespass. Private property trespass is still occurring along a portion of the route.

This project is in conjunction with a reroute Project. The unauthorized routes will be closed and returned to a natural state after the BLM constructs the new route around the private property. The new route will be designated for all types of OHV use. Additionally, the Project would to improve visual resource, reduce airborne dust and increase watershed quality.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

1 mile of road approximately 30 feet wide.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

Post project monitoring, including soil monitoring would be conducted bi-annually to assess the proposed action's effectiveness. Visitor use and compliance monitoring would be conducted weekly for the first year and be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed Project and determine maintenance or enforcement needs. Assistance in casual monitoring of this project will be performed by the Chalfant Public Land Stewardship, a group of citizens formed to correct problems in the area caused by irresponsible recreational use.

Please see p 31-33 of the environmental assessment for details on cumulative effects and monitoring at:

http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf

E. List of Reports

N/A

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

N/A

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

As stated in the Project description, the law enforcement or park rangers would patrol the area at a minimum of once per week. The Project area would be physically barricaded to prevent OHVs into the area. Educational signing would be placed at the

barricade. Additionally, this project has been discussed in a public meeting and subsequent field trip to view the project area. Community volunteers have committed to assisting the BLM in monitoring and compliance of the Project.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700356

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Chalfant Restoration Map](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Chalfant 1](#)

[Chalfant 2](#)

[Chalfant 3](#)

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)

3/1/2010

Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - Bishop Field Office		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)	PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	G09-01-05-R01
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>The Project is to permanently close unauthorized user created motorized roads and return of land, plant communities, and plant covers to conditions comparable to those of surrounding lands. The Project is approximately 1 mile in length and is located on the west side of Chalfant Valley.</p> <p>Treatments include: barricading motorized access by the placement of large native rocks or wood post and beam barricades; vertical mulching; planting and seeding of native vegetation; hand construction of water control devices; interruptive and educational signing of BLM's actions and public outreach.</p> <p>The Project is in conjunction with rerouting a designated motorized route.</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Other-Law Enforcement	600.000	39.000	HRS	18,400.00	5,000.00	23,400.00
	Park Ranger	320.000	30.000	HRS	9,600.00	0.00	9,600.00
	Notes : Federal Law Enforcement Officer will patrol Project area once weekly.						
	Recreation Planner	40.000	36.000	HRS	0.00	1,440.00	1,440.00
	Notes : Recreation Planner will coordinate, plan, schedule, administer, provide labor, produce maps, keep records and deliver report to Division.						
	Archeologist	40.000	24.000	HRS	960.00	0.00	960.00
	Notes : Cultural inventory and monitoring of Project area during						

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	work.						
	Botanist Notes : Botanist will plan direct and monitor seeding and transplants.	80.000	35.000	HRS	2,100.00	700.00	2,800.00
	Other-Volunteers Notes : California Native Plant Society operates and maintains native plant propagation and collects native seeds, grows seedlings for use in Project.	100.000	18.000	HRS	0.00	1,800.00	1,800.00
	Total for Staff				31,060.00	8,940.00	40,000.00
2	Contracts						
	Heavy Equipment Operator Notes : Inyo National Forest equipment and operators	1.000	4500.000	EA	4,500.00	0.00	4,500.00
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Route Markers	50.000	12.740	EA	637.00	0.00	637.00
	Other-Strip Decals	50.000	3.600	EA	180.00	0.00	180.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				817.00	0.00	817.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	Other-Volunteer Mileage	2500.000	0.500	MI	1,250.00	0.00	1,250.00
	Other-Patrol Motorcycle Notes : Enforcement Patrol Motorcycle maintenance and repair	1.000	500.000	EA	500.00	0.00	500.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				1,750.00	0.00	1,750.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						
	Indirect Costs-Administrative Costs	1.000	3800.000	EA	0.00	3,800.00	3,800.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Total Program Expenses					38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: BLM - Bishop Field Office
Application: Restoration Chalfant 2010 (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	31,060.00	8,940.00	40,000.00	
2	Contracts	4,500.00	0.00	4,500.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	817.00	0.00	817.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	1,750.00	0.00	1,750.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	3,800.00	3,800.00	
Total Program Expenses		38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		38,127.00	12,740.00	50,867.00	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700356

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

No negative impact to wetlands, navigable waters, and sensitive habitats and species would occur. (including threatened and endangered species). Projects would be designed to ensure no additional opportunity for sediment (the major water quality pollutant) transport in to streams, springs and shallow pond locations. Additionally, sensitive habitats and species would benefit from the Project by restoring habitat and removing habitat fragmentation. Water quality and habitat is furthered discussed in Environmental Assessment CA-170-06-26 and can be viewed at:
http://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/bishop_pdfs/eadocs/fy06/restoration_ea_final_for_web.pdf

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

Since the High Desert OHV Plan (1993), cumulative past actions have consisted of about 30 restoration projects improving up to 30 acres of public land including annual maintenance of about 25-30 miles of motorized routes. These actions have occurred across 750,000 acres of public land in the eastern Sierra. Some motorized access opportunities have been lost with access use shifting to the remaining 2,400+ miles of routes on public lands.

BLM is currently implementing between 2 and 4 restoration projects totaling about 0.5 acres of surface area with annual route maintenance totaling about 3 miles per year.

These past and present projects have cumulatively improved cultural resources, vegetative and wildlife habitat, visual resources, etc. Additionally, annual maintenance has kept motorized access opportunities available and protected adjacent resources for public appreciation and use.

Although it is uncertain what projects would be identified as reasonably foreseeable future actions, past and present restoration/management practices lead us to believe that between 2 and 6 projects would be targeted annually for

implementation, totaling possibly 2 - 4 acres of surface restoration. Several miles of annual route maintenance would continue to have beneficial effects for motorized access use.

Over the next ten years, the aggregate value of all expected future projects would expand the benefits to more modest levels of up to 40 acres of public land restoration and improvement. The proposed action would create several positive future effects from multiple and small incremental project accomplishments. This overall improvement would have commensurate benefits to wildlife populations including water, wetlands, air quality, and soils. Native vegetation would recover better with a corresponding decline in weed infestation. Soil compaction and erosion would lessen while fugitive dust emissions and sediment deposition in water would also decrease.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

The possibilities that this project would have such an effect are none. The project seeks to lessen impacts by closing steep hill climbs or routes to vehicles (and, where necessary for recovery, foot traffic) where erodible soil exist. During implementation personnel would avoid steep slopes, erodible soils and sensitive areas and would not create new or braided hiking trails through repeated use. No structures or roads would be built. Project vehicles are restricted to existing roads, trails and parking areas.

OHV impacts to soil resources are a direct result of vegetation removal and alteration. Loss of plant cover increases the effects of the desert environment on soils. As shade, wind protection, and organic litter are lost on a site, wind velocities over the soil surface increase, water infiltration is reduced and microorganisms naturally found in the soil may be impacted. This process leads to poor soil structure and loss of topsoil, soil fertility and water retention properties (Bainbridge and Virginia 1990). These soil impacts are exacerbated when OHV routes occur on steep, topography, especially in desert scrub plant communities.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

The project will have a positive effect on scenic values. All Projects would be implemented to conform to prescribed visual resource management (VRM) classes. Restoration sites currently have a high visual contrast with the surrounding vegetation in the view shed. This draws the observer's attention to the surface disturbance, thus compromising VRM class objectives. The project seeks to improve visual resources by bringing back natural vegetation patterns.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

Cultural report CA-170-10-08. A class III intensive cultural survey concluded that 'No cultural properties will be negatively affected by this project'.

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The possibility that uses may go elsewhere is present. To help prevent off-site impacts rangers will patrol the surrounding areas looking for new routes. We currently have a complete GPS inventory and aerial photos taken in 2005. Patrol personnel have this data available to them for use in the field.

Past Projects, such as this, have not increased the use in the vicinity of the Project site.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[OHV Route Restoration EA](#)

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700356

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 0

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☐ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☒ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 2

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☐ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☐ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

User created routes on steep slopes causing soil erosion.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)
☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Unauthorized routes are causing habitat fragmentation, soil erosion and are creating airborne dust.

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 12

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Site will be monitored by BLM staff weekly. If monitoring shows 95% compliance then monitoring by BLM staff will be reduced. However, the Chalfant Public Land Stewardship (CPLS) - a group of citizens that live and recreate in the area, have agreed to informally monitor for success on a weekly basis.

The Project would use large rocks collected from the surrounding area or post and beam barricades to physically block vehicle access to the restoration areas. Native vegetation, seedlings and broadcast seeding, would take place in the fall for the 3 year duration of the Project to ensure plant cover is restored.

Educational signing will be placed at project locations and, in addition, there is a dedicated kiosk at the local general store to address public land issues such as the Project.

The Project incorporates the construction of an alternative route in a less environmentally sensitive location.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

BLM Bishop Field Office's Resource Management Plan (RMP 1993) which limits motorized vehicle use to designated roads and trails. These unauthorized routes do not exist on BLM's current travel management route inventory as authorized routes, and subsequently are subject to closure and restoration.

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

Bishop BLM receives congressionally appropriated annual and deferred maintenance dollars for projects such as this.

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)

- ☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

A public meeting to discuss the proposed project was held January 6, 2010. Stakeholders included the county supervisor, CHP, county deputy sheriff, land owners adjacent to the project and interested citizens. A subsequent public field trip on January 23, 2010 was held with various user groups. (Motorized, equestrian, hiking and private land owners affected by the Project)

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Chalfant Public Land Stewardship, Friends of the Inyo, Central California RAC, California Native Plant Society.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

Yes, the illegal roads were user created because the only designate north/south and east/west OHV route, which passed through private property, was developed to avoid passing next to the home that has been built. The solution is to construct a new route around the private property. The unauthorized routes will be closed and returned to a natural state after the BLM constructs the new route. The new route will be designated for all types of OHV use.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)

- ☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ☒ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)